April 24, 2025 • Francis Brown Taylor

Teaching the Future:

What AI in Education Actually Looks Like from Inside an African Classroom

---

Here's something I've noticed after sixteen years in classrooms, staff rooms, and training halls across Ghana: the moment you mention artificial intelligence to a group of teachers, the room splits almost immediately. Half of them lean forward. The other half fold their arms. And both reactions, honestly, make complete sense.

AI in education has become one of those topics that people either dismiss as over-hyped Western tech evangelism or embrace so enthusiastically that they start treating it like it'll solve everything — overcrowded classrooms, under trained staff, underfunded schools, the whole lot. The reality, as with most things worth thinking carefully about, sits somewhere in the messier middle.

I've spent a significant part of my career sitting in both camps at different times. I've been the skeptic. I've been the enthusiast. And I've slowly arrived at something closer to a working philosophy — one shaped not by Silicon Valley white papers but by actual rooms full of actual children in Tema, in Anum, in training halls where the projector sometimes works and the internet sometimes doesn't.

So this is my honest attempt to think through what AI in education really means — not as an abstract policy question, but as a lived, practical, sometimes chaotic reality for teachers and learners in sub-Saharan Africa specifically, and for anyone who cares about what good teaching actually requires.

Let's Start With the Hype, Because It's Real

It'd be dishonest to pretend the excitement isn't justified. Generative AI tools — the kind that can write lesson plans, answer student questions at 2am, translate content into local languages, generate practice exercises in seconds — represent a genuinely significant shift in what's possible for a teacher working alone with limited resources.

Think about what a secondary school teacher in rural Ghana actually deals with. They might have 60 or 70 students in a room designed for 35. They're preparing students for national exams while also managing pastoral care, administrative paperwork, and sometimes physical infrastructure problems. Their prep time is squeezed. Their marking load is relentless. And professional development? Often a one-day workshop once a year, if they're lucky.

Now imagine that same teacher has access to a tool that can generate differentiated worksheets based on student level, help them write clearer explanations of complex concepts, or summarise a dense curriculum document in plain language. That's not a trivial improvement — that's potentially transformative. Not because the AI replaces the teacher's expertise, but because it gives that expertise more room to operate.

That's the good version of the hype. And it's real. I've seen it work.

But the Infrastructure Problem Is Also Very Real

Here's the thing nobody in a comfortable office in San Francisco is accounting for: you can't use any of this without electricity and internet. That sounds almost too obvious to say, but it bears saying plainly because it shapes everything.

Ghana's urban centres — Accra, Tema, Kumasi — have decent enough connectivity in many areas. Schools in wealthier districts often have

computer labs, even if the machines are ageing. But step outside those pockets of relative comfort and the picture changes fast. Intermittent power. Spotty mobile data. Schools where sharing a single tablet between thirty students is already considered well-resourced.

This isn't a reason to give up on AI integration in African education. It's a reason to be clear-eyed about what integration actually requires. The conversation can't just be about what tools exist — it has to be about what scaffolding needs to be built before those tools become usable at scale. Power infrastructure. Affordable data. Device access. Teacher digital literacy. These aren't nice-to-haves. They're prerequisites.

One thing I've found useful, both in my own practice and when training other educators, is distinguishing between what I'd call connected AI and offline-adjacent AI. Fully connected tools — live chatbots, cloud-based adaptive platforms — need reliable internet to function. But some AI-assisted resources can be downloaded, adapted offline, and deployed without a live connection. Thinking carefully about which tools fit which context matters enormously, and it's a distinction that often gets glossed over in generalist conversations about EdTech.

What Teachers Actually Need From AI — As Opposed to What Vendors Think They Need

I've sat through a lot of EdTech pitches and training sessions over the years. And one pattern that keeps showing up is the mismatch between what the technology is designed to do and what teachers in resource-constrained environments actually need it to do.

A lot of AI-powered platforms are built around personalised learning dashboards — the idea being that the system tracks individual student progress, surfaces gaps, and recommends tailored content. It's a compelling model. It's also largely built for contexts where students have individual

devices and consistent access, where data protection frameworks are mature, and where teachers have time to monitor dashboard analytics.

Strip away those assumptions and the model frays. A teacher managing 65 students on shared tablets doesn't have the bandwidth to engage with individual learning pathways in the way the platform assumes. That's not a failure of the teacher — it's a failure of design empathy.

What I've found actually works, and what I try to convey when I'm running professional development for educators, is focusing on AI as a preparation and planning tool rather than a delivery mechanism. In other words: using AI to save time and improve quality on the things that happen before and after classroom contact — lesson planning, resource creation, assessment design, feedback drafting — rather than trying to embed it into the live learning experience itself.

That shift in framing changes what tools you reach for, how you train people to use them, and what success looks like. It's more modest than the full personalised-learning-platform vision. It's also more achievable, more durable, and more respectful of what teachers on the ground actually face.

The Trust Question — Which Is Really a Pedagogy Question

One of the more interesting conversations I keep having with educators — both new teachers and experienced ones who are encountering AI tools for the first time — is about trust. Specifically: when should a teacher trust what an AI produces, and when should they be skeptical?

This matters a great deal in curriculum work. AI language models are trained on vast amounts of text, but that text skews heavily toward certain languages, cultures, and educational traditions. Ask a generative AI tool to produce a lesson plan on Ghanaian history and you'll often get something that's technically competent but culturally thin — missing the local context,

the oral traditions, the specific historiographical debates that a well-prepared Ghanaian Social Studies teacher would naturally incorporate.

That's not the AI being malicious. It's just reflecting the data it was trained on, which reflects longstanding imbalances in whose knowledge gets digitised, preserved, and made widely accessible. It's a structural problem that no single tool is going to fix.

What it means practically is that using AI well requires exactly the kind of deep subject-matter expertise and contextual knowledge that good teachers already possess. The AI doesn't replace that expertise — it needs it. A teacher who understands Ghanaian Social Studies deeply will immediately recognise when an AI-generated lesson plan misses something important. A novice teacher without that grounding might not catch it.

This is why I've become increasingly convinced that AI literacy for educators can't just be about tool usage. It has to include critical evaluation — teaching teachers to interrogate AI outputs rather than simply accept them. That's a higher-order skill, and it's one that requires time and deliberate practice to develop. It's also, if we're honest, a version of the critical thinking we've always wanted students to develop. Maybe part of the value of AI integration is forcing educators to model that thinking more explicitly.

What I've Seen Work in Practice

Let me get specific for a moment, because specifics are more useful than principles.

During my time as an Early Childhood Education Trainer in Tema, I started experimenting with using AI tools to help educators draft differentiated activity sets — the same learning objective addressed at three or four different complexity levels, so that a classroom with mixed ability could all

be working toward the same goal through appropriately pitched tasks. Doing this manually is time-consuming enough that many teachers simply don't do it. With AI assistance, it became something that could be scaffolded into a lesson planning routine without adding significant hours.

The key was always the review step. Teachers learned to generate the content, then go through it carefully, correcting what was culturally off, adjusting what was pedagogically weak, and adding the kind of locally resonant examples that made material feel relevant to their specific students. The AI did the structural heavy lifting. The teacher provided the intelligence that made it actually useful.

I've also seen AI tools used effectively for professional development design — helping trainers structure workshop content, generate discussion prompts, and create assessment rubrics for evaluating teacher practice. Again, the outputs needed human oversight and refinement. But the starting point being generated quickly freed up mental energy for higher-level design thinking.

What consistently doesn't work is deploying a new tool without adequate preparation, support, or follow-up. I've watched schools invest in devices and subscriptions, hold a single introductory session, and then wonder why adoption is low and impact is minimal. The technology is almost never the problem. The professional development model is.

The Equity Conversation We Need to Have More Honestly

Here's something I think deserves more direct attention than it usually gets: AI in education has the potential to both reduce and deepen existing inequalities, and which direction it goes depends almost entirely on decisions being made right now by governments, funders, school leaders, and technology companies.

The optimistic case is genuinely compelling. AI could give a well-trained, well-supported teacher in a rural school access to planning resources and pedagogical support that was previously only available in well-resourced urban institutions. It could help less experienced teachers develop their practice faster. It could make high-quality content accessible in local languages that have historically been underserved by educational publishing.

The pessimistic case is equally plausible. If the best AI tools require expensive subscriptions, reliable internet, and significant digital literacy to use effectively — and if all the professional development resources go to schools that are already well-resourced — then AI integration simply becomes another mechanism by which educational advantage concentrates further. The schools that are already winning get better. The schools that are already struggling are told to wait until the infrastructure catches up.

This isn't speculative. It's a pattern that's played out with every previous wave of educational technology. Interactive whiteboards. Computer labs. E-learning platforms. Each time, the gap between well-resourced and under-resourced contexts widened before — and sometimes instead of — narrowing.

I don't raise this to be fatalistic. I raise it because I think teachers, trainers, and education leaders need to be advocating loudly for equity-conscious AI deployment — pushing back when technology is rolled out without attention to access, without investment in professional development, without consultation with the communities it's meant to serve. That advocacy is part of our professional responsibility. It's not optional.

The Human Teaching That AI Can't Replicate — And Shouldn't Try To

I want to end with something that feels important to name, because I think

it sometimes gets lost in these conversations.

The most important things that happen in a well-functioning classroom — the moment a student's face changes when a concept finally clicks, the way a skilled teacher reads a room and adjusts their approach in real time, the relationship of trust and challenge that develops between an educator and a child over months and years — none of that is AI-replicable. Not because the technology isn't advancing, but because those things are fundamentally relational. They're about one human being attending closely and caringly to another human being's growth.

I've been in classrooms where I've watched teachers change the trajectories of children's lives through sheer commitment, creativity, and presence. I've also been in classrooms where the physical resources were excellent and the human relationships were perfunctory — and the learning was correspondingly thin.

AI is a tool. A genuinely useful one, used thoughtfully. But the thing that makes education worth doing — that animating sense of one mind igniting another — is irreducibly human. And if we lose sight of that while chasing the efficiency gains and the personalisation dashboards, we'll have made a very expensive mistake.

For educators navigating this moment, I think the most useful frame is this: AI is here to give you more capacity to do the human parts of teaching well. Use it to clear time. Use it to sharpen your materials. Use it to extend your professional development beyond what geography and budget would otherwise allow. And then use the time and clarity you've gained to be more present, more attentive, and more genuinely useful to the students and communities you serve.

That's the deal I've made with it, anyway. Sixteen years in, I'm still figuring it out — but that framing has served me pretty well.

Francis Brown Taylor is an Education Leader, Trainer, and Curriculum Specialist based in Tema, Ghana. Ghana Director of the International Teachers Association. UNESCO MGIEP Global Citizenship Education Graduate.